

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 7-12 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

DRAWINGS

Upon reconsideration, the drawings filed 16 March 2004 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant has amended Claim 2 to overcome the objection to the drawings. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaeffer, et al. (previously of record). Claim 1 has been amended to define that the elastic packing is also attached to the plate-shaped door portion. Schaefer, et al. only attaches O-ring 102 to the door shaft 80.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 6, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Alternately for Claims 1, 3 and 6, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito, et al. Claim 1 has been amended to define that the elastic packing is also attached to the plate-shaped door portion. Ito, et al. only attaches link shaft 117 to the door shaft 101.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3, 4 and 6, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito, et al. (previously of record) in view of Wakamatu, et al. Claim 5 ultimately depends from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claim 5 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claim 7 is an independent claim which defines a cantilever door with a door shaft formed on an end of the plate-shaped door portion. A clearance is defined between the door shaft and a bearing hole provided on the case along an axial direction of the door shaft. The elastic member is defined as surrounding the door shaft at least on a central portion along the axial direction of the door shaft. Neither Schaeffer, et al. or Ito, et al. disclose a clearance along an axial direction of the door shaft and an elastic member surrounding a central portion along the axial length of the door shaft. The elastic members and clearance is only at the ends of the shaft. Claims 8-11 depend ultimately from Claim 7.

New Claim 12 is an independent claim which defines that the plate-shaped door portion extends radially from the door shaft and has first and second ends spaced axially along the door shaft, the elastic member being disposed between the first and second ends of the plate-shaped door portion. Neither Schaeffer, et al. or Ito, et al. disclose an elastic member between the two ends of the plate-shaped door portion.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 14, 2007

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg